Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/654,362	BROWNE, MARTIN MONTEAGLE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robin A. Hylton	3727
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowance</u>		
(1) Robin A. Hylton.	(3)	
(2) Robert Chisholm.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 31 May 2006	Time: <u>pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ No Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 112, 1 st and/or 2 nd ; non-statutory double patenting		
Claims discussed: 1,3, and 4		
Prior art documents discussed: Patents to Browne 6,223,918 and 6,659,296		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of the interview in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	. The examiner will provide a writte ate record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
•		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	cant/Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Changes to the claims as set forth in the accompanying examiner's amendment obviate potential rejections under 35 USC 112, 1st and/or 2nd paragraph. In view of applicant's remarks field March 3, 2006, the non-statuary double patenting rejection is withdrawn with respect to US Patent 6,223,918. However, the double patenting rejection is still applicable to US Patent 6,659,296. Mr. Chisholm indicated terminal disclaimer is forthcoming.